DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 513 UD 024 851

AUTHOR Cummings, Richard L.; Bridges, Edward F.
TITLE Multiculturalism and Teacher Education: The Rhetoric and a Reality.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cross Cultural Training; Ethnic Studies; *Multicultural Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This paper considers the problems of multiculturalism and teacher education with specific reference to the situation in Wisconsin. The first section deals with the historical interest in multicultural education in America and what the concept means. The second section describes the Human Relations Code in Wisconsin which requires preparation in this area for preservice teachers, and outlines its precepts. The next section presents the findings of a survey of the 30 teacher training institutions in Wisconsin in which respondents were asked to describe the way in which multicultural education components were made available in their curricula and to what extent they were considered important. Multicultural fieldwork and comparative education were ranked high in importance by respondents but were found to be underrepresented in the curricula of the teacher training institutions. It was further found that commitments to providing multicultural education experiences were not met. It is concluded that little is being done in teacher education programs in Wisconsin to address ethnocentric attitudes or to prepare teachers for work in the multicultural classroom. (CG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED269513

MULTICULTURALISM AND TEACHER EDUCATION:

THE RHETORIC AND A REALITY

Richard L. Cummings
Professor
Department of Cultural Foundations of Education

and

Edgar F. Bridges
Assistant Professor
Department of Community Education
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

March 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Cummings

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 024 851

MULTICULTURALISM AND TEACHER EDUCATION: THE RHETORIC AND A REALITY

by

Richard L. Cummings and Edgar F. Bridges

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

ABSTRACT

During the 1970s, there was considerable pressure brought to bear on teacher education institutions in the nation as a whole to introduce multiracial and multicultural content into their teacher education curricula. These pressures came from citizen groups and official reports from such organizations as Departments of Public Instruction, and teacher education task force groups. In Wisconsin, nothing much beyond the promulgation of the DPI's Human Relations Code came of these pressures. Yet, after 12 years of the Human Relations Code, teachers are still commonly blamed for being racist, ethnocentric and insensitive to our culturally diverse Wisconsin, national and global society.

This paper argues that the teachers are less at fault than the teacher educators and that, unless the latter move to introduce more content in multicultural education into students' pre-service and in-service programs, there is little hope for change. Unfortunately, based on an analysis of the teaching of multicultural content in the 1985 curricula of the teacher training institutions in Wisconsin, little is being done to address ethnocentric attitudes or to prepare students for teaching in multicultural classrooms in an increasingly interdependent world.

WD 024 651

MULTICULTURALISM AND TEACHER EDUCATION: THE RHETORIC AND A REALITY

THE NATION'S RHETORIC

The American educational community witnessed a growing emphasis on the concept of multicultual education during the 1970s. School districts in many parts of the nation mounted in-service programs on the subject for teachers and other school personnel. State departments of education mandated multicultural requirements for candidates seeking certification and re-certification. Colleges and universities established various types of courses and programs of a multicultural character. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) had incorporated multicultural education into its standards for accrediting teacher education programs by 1976.

The preamble to Standard 2.1.1., the "multicultural" standard, opens with this paragraph:

> Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluating and behaving in different cultural settings. Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society.[1]

As the language of this excerpt from the preamble indicates, the framers of the multicultural standard based their advocacy on several assumptions:

1. That education, as it applied to formal learning experiences provided in schools, did not adequately prepare individuals to function effectively in a culturally diverse society;
2. That the society in the United States is pluralistic in character and that this pluralism will become an increasingly important factor in the future development of the nation;

3. that educators and educational institutions play an important role in shaping social behavior and must assume a principal responsibility for leadership in the development of a multicultural society;
4. that the monitoring and assessment of the educational enterprise is not complete unless educators and educational institutions are evaluated with respect to the provision of educational experiences that are consistent with the reality of the multiculturalism of American society.

The assumptions that underlie the development of the multicultural standard were not new. They reflect observations that had been made by many writers about education. For example, the United States Commissioner of Education in his 1974 report to the Congress included the following statements:

> For generations Americans regarded their school system as the great melting pot and equalizer of society. In a social system characterized by cultural pluralism, the schools were expected to play a major role in imparting national culture and traditions. Since the 1960s, however, schools have also been called upon to make good on equality of opportunity in education for all.
>
> This latter development, enhanced by massive support throughout the country for local autonomy, individualism, and self determination, is molding new trends in the education system. the demands of special interest groups are resulting in increased diversity in educational services.[2]

The Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education spoke eloquently regarding the urgency of multicultural education. In its report, the Commission stated that:

> Teacher educators must maintain a profound commitment to human rights, particularly the rights of children. Unfortunately, teacher educators have not always been conscious exemplars of human rights. Few actively advocate the rights of minority groups or promote cultural pluralism. Today, leaders ask the education profession to develop in students those attitudes and beliefs which support cultural pluralism as a possitive social force. Thus, the

> education of teacher educators must be substantive enough to develop a respect for the culture, life-styles, and contributions of non-mainstream cultures. Teacher educators also need a commitment to universal human values in order to promote harmonious coexistence.[3]

It is not surprising that there was a great deal of anxiety about the new multicultural standards. For many, multicultural education was a concept that lacked definition. While the preamble to the standard may have helped to clarify it to some degree, it did not adequately answer very basic questions such as: What does the term multicultural education mean? How will one know when a teacher education program is multicultural? What must an institution do to assure the accrediting agency that the standard is met? Answers to these questions do not come easily. However, it must be recognized that conscious application of the principles of multicultural education requires careful thought and planning throughout the process of program design, development and implementation. That process must be based on an understanding of an appreciation for multiculturalism as a positive force in American education.

As the standard's preamble indicates, multicultural education is an on-going process. It is not a body of subject matter to be easily packaged in separate courses and learning experiences that are added to the teacher education program in a laissez-faire manner. Ideally, multicultural education is a term that should be descriptive of the total educational experience. Multicultural education presumes an acceptance of and a commitment to cultural pluralism for all teachers and administrators. Without this acceptance and commitment, the development of a multicultural education program is difficult, if not impossible.

Contrary to what many seem to believe, multicultural education focuses on individual as well as group welfare, teacher educators have for generations urged prospective teachers to consider the psychological characteristics that set one student apart from another. They have for generations been told that the child

learns better when instruction is fitted to his or her unique needs and interests. Much has been done with respect to the role of psychological differences in learning. On the other hand, little is known about the role of cultural factors. Cole Bembreck and Walker Hill addressed this point in the introduction to their book Cultural Challenges to Education with these comments:

> Cultural characteristics touch us (educators) at the level of feeling, emotion, and prejudice. Instead of according them recognition and respect, as we do psychological differences, we tend to assign them "good" and "bad" designations, and we let our expectations of students be influenced by them. We tend to use cultural characteristics such as race, ethnic and national origins, language, and minority status for the purpose of sorting promising students from the unpromising. We apparently find it difficult to come at the matter of cultural diversity positively. We do not ask how cultural aptitudes might be used to support and enhance a child's classroom learning; instead, we tend to ignore or suppress these differences.[4]

Multicultual education presumes that cultural differences are as much of a child's background as psychological differences and that they are influential in his or her learning. Multicultural education, then, is the process by which cultural as well as psychological differences are brought to bear to enhance the learning environment for each individual.

There were and are those who seem to believe that multicultural education is somehow synonymous with special programs for minorities and women. For persons who hold this point of view, programs in Black Studies, Chicano Studies, Native American Studies and the like are sufficient for teaching and learning about cultural differences. The multicultural standard's preamble implies, however, that the aim of multicultural education is to produce individuals who are comfortably functional in multicultural settings. The focus is not on the creation and perpetuation of distinct cultural sub-units. Multicultural education requires that our educational institutions acquaint all students with the broad range of cultural diversity that exists both in the United States and beyond our national borders. It also requires the provision of learning

experiences designed to teach students the analytical skills necessary to compete for the statuses of their choice. Ethnic Studies or Women's Studies may indeed be a part of multicultural education, but they do not represent the concept in its totality.

Multicultural education presumes an awareness of the teaching act as a cross-cultural encounter. Every student brings to the classroom a unique cultural identity. That identity is significantly affected by the manner in which the student is perceived by classmates and, most importantly, by the teacher. In a classroom where the instructional process is insensitive to the cultural differences that exist or where the teaching-learning activity is essentially monocultural, students whose cultural background and experiences differ from that being stressed are negatively affected. They are, in a real sense, outsiders. The most well-meaning teachers who plans and organizes instruction from a monocultural perspective is likely to encounter indifference, antagonism or outright hostility. For the students whose cultural backgrounds are different, the educational experiences provided are frequently viewed as a put down or a denial of the legitimacy of their heritage. The effect of such experiences on students over a period of years can be devastating.

The effect of such cross-cultural encounters on teachers over a period of years can also be devastating. Margaret Le Compte[5] has suggested that one major reason of why most teachers remain in the profession for fewer than five years[6] is the impact off culture shock.

She started with the notion that many teachers burn out because of stress deriving from contact with children from cultures different from their own. They fall into culture shock, or a reaction to situations where the sights, sounds, smells, attitudes, values, and behavior patterns they encounter are different from those they usually expect and where their customary patterns of belief and

behavior do not elicit the expected response. While initial contact with culturally different people can be exciting, even euphoric, being forced to accommodate for a prolonged period of time with a world full of shocks and suprises eventually results in fear, hostility, paranoia, and even in physical illness. It is hard to understand what is happening, hard to be understood, hard to feel successful in whatever endeavors one pursues.

Teaching is a highly affective enterprise; many of the rewards of the profession derive from interpersonal relations with students and the joy of watching children learn, grow, and get "turned on." When their efforts fail to produce anticipated results, teachers feel like failures; as new nationally mandated assessment procedures come more and more to judge teacher performance by the measured performance of their students, teachers may actually be defined as failures by their superiors because of their inability to read other cultures.

Inability to read other cultures, then, may contribute greatly to lack of job satisfaction in schools because teachers cannot figure out how to motivate their students to make them "turn on." It may also cause teachers to make judgments about a child's intellectual capabilities on the basis of social rather than cognitive indicators. A teacher is much more likely to define as unteachable a child who comes to school late, hungry, unwashed, or speaking nonstandard English, than a child who appears well-dressed, fluent, and cared-for. Similarly, teachers may give up on children of a parent who cannot attend teacher conferences, even if the reason is a conflict in work schedules.

Probably the most critical area is divergence from standard English. Children who cannot speak correctly also probably do not write correctly; to the extent that teachers focus on the delivery rather than the content of answers, such students may be labelled as incapable of emitting acceptable responses and will be graded accordingly.

Benjamin Bloom, in his book, Human Characteristics and School Learning, states that students in school are taught at least two courses of study, the manifest curriculum and the latent curriculum. Bloom's remarks about these two curricula seem to have special meaning for multicultural education. The manifest curriculum is the curriculum that the students is expected to learn.

> This curriclum includes the reading, mathematics, science, literature, social studies and other school subjects that he or she is taught. This curriculum may be of great importance to the learner because of the competence he develops, the interests and attitudes he acquires, and the career opportunities which are made available to those who learn it well . . . Some of it may be repeated and used repeatedly by the learners, while some of it may be forgotten quickly and discarded. The manifest curriculum is visible; it is documented in many ways; and most of the resources and personnel of the school are dedicated to the student's learning of this curriculum.[7]

The latent curriculum, writes Bloom, is uniquely taught to and differently learned by each student. He goes on to state:

> This is the curriculum which teaches the student who he is in relation to others. It may also teach each person his or her place in the world of people, of ideas and of activities. While the student may learn this curriculum more slowly than the other, it is likely that he will not be able to forget it as easily as he can forget the details of history the rules of grammar, or the specifics of a subject of study in the manifest curriculum.[8]

Multicultural education focuses on the latent curriculum, not at the expense of the manifest curriculum but as supplement to it. The multicultural standard rests on the assumption that teacher education programs can provide competencies and skills that will enable teachers to utilize qualities of the latent curriculum in the teaching-learning process. A single educational system teaches us that we are a society, not a collection of segregated societies separate and unequal.

The NCATE standard on multicultural education required a serious review of teacher education programs in colleges and universities. To quote again from the report by the AACTE Bicentennial Commission,

> Multicultural education is a great challenge to the teaching profession. It is not that the challenges themselves are new since championing the rights of children, striving to achieve a pedagogy responsibe to all children's learning needs, and helping expand educational opportunities to include all social groups are inherent in the role of a teacher. What is new and significant is the commitment to preserve and enhance rather than melt away the uniqueness of cultural groups in the society. New also is the too seldom emphasized need for teachers to search for and emphasize the core values of American life which are the basis for unity amidst diversity.[9]

The foundation of an effective multicultural teacher program rests on institutional commitment. Without the support and commitment of the institution as a whole, there is little likelihood that the education unit can be successful in establishing a program that is consistent with the principles of multiculturalism. The institution's commitment must be clear and unequivocal. Rhetorically, it should be explicated in the institution's statement of its mission.

Institutional commitment to multicultural education must be reflected in reality at the operational level. This commitment should be evident in the selection, admission and retention of students, in the recruitment and hiring of faculty, administrators, and staff and in the institution's relationship to the community that it serves. A multicultural teacher education program is dependent on an institutional environment that is congruent with the goals of multiculturalism. The establishment of such an environment is a necessary step in the development of the systematic plan for multiculturalism in teacher education as required by the NCATE standard and the AACTE Bicentennial Commission position.

The NCATE multicultural standard clearly states that the institution's provision for multicultural education must become an integral part of its curriculum design. In formulating an operational definition and a plan that provides for multicultural education, institutions are thus reminded that this process is part of the larger process of conceptualizing the teacher's role as a

cultural worker and broker and establishing objectives based on that conceptualization. The ten "essential understandings" compiled by Asa Hilliard suggest elements of the concepualization of the teacher's role from a multicultural perspective:

1. The teaching process is (nearly) always a cross-cultural encounter.
2. The personality, values, and social background of a teacher are critical cultural inputs.
3. All teaching tools are culture-bound.
4. The classroom is not a benign context but a potent matrix.
5. Teachers must understand how the student can be a victim (of oppressive social and economic conditions).
6. Teachers must understand that all minds are equally complex.
7. Teachers must be helped to understand that the poor and racial or ethnic minorities can and acutally have been able to learn at the same level as others when proper enviromental support was provided.
8. Teachers must understand that learning is related to a sense of power over some of the forces which impinge upon our lives.
9. Teachers must understand how their own expectations are determining factors in building a climate of growth for students.
10. Teachers must intimately understand the culture of their students.

A conception of a teacher's role that incorporates elements such as Hilliard's understandings provides a sound base for the development of a multicultural teacher education program. They suggest concrete approaches that can be translated into content for courses and learning experiences and thus permit those planning a multicultural program to move beyond mere generalization.[10]

WISCONSIN'S RHETORIC

The state of Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction developed a Human Relations Code that requires preparation in human relations and intergroup relations for preservice teachers. The code requires prospective teachers to have experiences in six code areas:

> Code 1. Development of attitudes, skills and techniques so that knowledge of human relations including intergroup relations can be translated into learning experiences for students.
>
> Code 2. A study of the values, lifestyles, and contributions of racial, cultural and economic groups in American society.
>
> Code 3. An analysis of the forces of racism, prejudice, and discrimination in American life and the impact of these forces on the experience of the majority and the minority.
>
> Code 4. Structured experiences in which teacher candidates have opportunities to examine their own attitudes and feelings about issues of racism, prejucice and discrimination.
>
> Code 5. Direct involvement with members of racial, cultural, and economic groups and/or with organizations working to improve human relations including intergroup relations.
>
> Code 6. Experience in evaluation the ways in which racism, prejudice, and discrimination can reflect in instructional materials.

The Human Relations Code requires each institution to make the policy an "integral part" of its teacher preparation program. This code requirement was well articulated in a human relations position paper prepared on May 3, 1971:

> "We cannot conceive of a course or experience which should not in some way address itself to the issues raised in this paper. Therefore, we would recommend that all faculty members be involved in an assessment of the kinds of clinical and academic experiences which are needed to fulfill the intent of the regulation ..." [11]

Basic to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction position was recognition of the fact that students were not prepared to live in a pluralistic society, and that teachers were not being prepared to teach them to do so. The essence of this claim was clearly stated in the human relations position paper of May 3, 1971:

> In many ways, schools have served to perpetuate intergroup conflict aid inequities. In their traditional tendency to relect the values and perceptions of the dominant white culture, educational institutions have failed to provide young people with an accurate view of the various groups in society and the nature of relationships among those groups. Most educators have had little opportunity to learn about the history and culture of groups outside their own and consequently, are ill-equipped to teach about the multiethnic nature of society. Often, educators are unable to work effectively with children who do not share their cultural background and conform to its rules and values. This inability to relate to children who are "different"--whether due to lack of knowledge and experience or to negative feelings and attitudes--is a major barrier to the achievement of equal educational opportunities. If schools are to help young people participate in a new and healthier level of mutual understanding and respect among all groups in society, a dramatic change in the preparation of educators in essential."

The State of Wisconsin's Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1972, Mr. William C. Kahl, saw the Human Relations Code requirements being so important that he wrote to the presidents or chancellors of <u>all</u> campuses with teacher training programs in Wisconsin about the Code. In his letter to the Chancellor of the UW-Milwaukee campus he wrote:

> I am writing you personally regarding this new Code requirement because I am convinced of its importance and believe it cannot be successfully implemented unless there is institutional commitment to such implementation. I urge you to personally support and to use the stature of your office to support all effective efforts pursued at your institution directed at meeting the intent of this new requirement.

And he went on to specify what he believed lay at the heart of "effective effort."

> If a program in this area of human relations and intergroup relations is to be completely successful at an institution, it should eventually, if not initially, permeate the entire program and not be seen exclusively as a part of the professional education sequence: that is, it should also be reflected in the general education or core requirement and in the academic area of specialty.[12]

WISCONSIN'S REALITY

Wisconsin's Human Relations Code, created in early 1972, went into effect on September 1, 1973. The code has been the predominant requirement affecting multicultural teacher education in Wisconsin for over 12 years. And so, it may be worth our time now to pause and look at what is being done to meet this requirement.

To this end, the 30 teacher training institutions in Wisconsin were asked to describe and evaluate the place of multicultural-focused efforts in both their pre-service and in-service programs offered in 1985/86. A 26-item questionnaire was mailed to the 30 teacher training institutions; 29 institutions returned completed questionnaires (after the necessary follow-up requests, in some cases). Respondents were asked to offer details of courses offered, levels at which courses were offered, (Bachelor's, Master's or doctoral level) and whether they believed that knowledge of our multicultural society/world and the implications of multiculturalism to teacher education was essential, important, useful, marginal or irrelevant for students in pre-service and in-service programs. They were asked to rank order their responses with 1 being the highest rank and 5 being the lowest rank. Multicultural education courses were placed in the spectrum of professional teacher education priorities by this ranking process. Multicultural education had three foci in this inquiry: 1) multiculturalism within the United States, 2) comparative education and 3) international interdependence.

Eleven institutions offer pre-service (Bachelor's-degree level) programs only; 16 institutions offer both pre-service (Bachelor's-degree level) and in-service (Master's-degree level) programs; and three institutions offer training through the doctoral level.

Respondents were asked to rank the importance of five general components of teacher education programs at both the pre-service and in-service levels on their campus. The results of this ranking are presented in Table I.

TABLE I

RANKED IMPORTANCE OF COMPONENTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

- 13 -

COMPONENTS	PRE-SERVICE	IN-SERVICE
Developmental Studies (physical and mental development of the individual)	4 (N=22)	4 (N=13)
General Studies (general education requirements; distributive humanities, fine arts natural science and social science courses)	2 (N=22)	5 (N=13)
Specializations (academic majors and/or minors, e.g., English, physical education)	1 (N=22)	3 (N=13)
Professional Decision Making (e.g., curriculum development, classroom management, testing)	3 (N=22)	1 (N=13)
Contexts of Learning (social, economic, political, cultural settings)	5 (N=22)	2 (N=13)

Note: 6 respondents stated either that they considered the five components to be equally important or that they could not rank them.

Respondents ranked the importance of academic majors and/or minors and general studies higher than professional education requirements at the pre-service level. It is worthy of note that respondents were all faculty members in teacher education programs. Respondents ranked professional decision making and cultural foundations as their highest priorities at the in-service level.

Respondents were asked to rank the importance of both "multicultural dimensions for teachers within the United States" and "knowledge of the multicultural aspects of American society" for pre-service education. The results of these two rankings are presented in Table II.

TABLE II

RANKED IMPORTANCE OF MULTICULTURAL DIMENSIONS ... KNOWLEDGE

MULTICULTURAL DIMENSIONS	RANK	KNOWLEDGE	RANK
Extremely useful	1 (N=27)	Essential	1 (N=27)
Very usefull	2 (N=22)	Important	2 (N=20)
Useful	3 (N=23)	Useful	3 (N=18)
Of little use	4 (N=22)	Marginal	4 (N=18)
Of no use	5 (N=23)	Irrelevant	5 (N=18)

Note: Some respondents marked only their first ranked choice.

Respondents were unanimous in their ranking of both multicultural dimensions and knowledge as extremely useful and essential for students in pre-service education. That is, multicultural experiences and knowledge are held to have the highest priority in pre-service education. The question now becomes, "where do students get these experiences and knowledge?"

Respondents were asked to rank the importance of course work in multicultural education at both the pre-service and in-service levels. The results of these rankings are presented in Table III.

TABLE III

RANKED IMPORTANCE OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION COURSE WORK

IMPORTANCE	PRE-SERVICE	IN-SERVICE
Essential	1 (N=27)	1 (N=18)
Important	2 (N=23)	2 (N=17)
Useful	3 (N=24)	3 (N=17)
Marginal	4 (N=23)	4 (N=16)
Irrelevant	5 (N=23)	5 (N=16)

The response patterns in Tables II and III are consistent. Multicultural dimensions of American society, knowledge of multicultural aspects of America and multicultural course work were unfailingly cited as "extremely useful" and "essential" components of teacher education programs. There are a great variety

of forms and formats within which teacher education programs in Wisconsin offer multicultural content. The following recommended means for meeting Human Relations Code requirements of the UW-Milwaukee School of Education are listed as follows:

Code 1. Educational Psychology 330 or Student Teaching Seminar.

Code 2. Cultural Foundations 375 or Art Education 200 or Art Education 375 or Music Education 380.

Code 3. Cultural Foundations 375 or Educational Psychology 320 or Exceptional Education 530, 300 or 700.

Code 4. Cultural Foundations 100 or Student Teaching Seminar.

Code 5. Cultural Foundations 200 or Student Teaching.

Code 6. Curriculum and Instruction 343, 545 or 649.

The UW-Milwaukee program, as developed in 1972 and initiated in September 1973, was evaluated as significantly more rigorous, demanding, detailed and staffed than was the UW-Madison program.[13] Yet, with the exception of Fine Art's Art Education 200 or 374 or Music Education 380, there are no Humanities or Social Science experiences from the College of Letters and Sciences in which UW-Milwaukee students all take their Freshman and Sophomore-level general education requirements. Nor are any ethnic studies offerings cited as Human Relations Code options for certification. The UW-Milwaukee program does not begin to "permeate the entire program and not be seen exclusively as a part of the professional education sequence" as called for by William Kohl.

The UW-Milwaukee School of Education's program for meeting Wisconsin's Human Relations Code has been cut well back from its initial activities in the mid-1970s. Our provision is well short of our promise. Educational reform movements related to race and ethnicity emerge when Americans become deeply

concerned about racial problems and fade when we set new priorities. "A Nation at Risk" set new priorities in 1983. Vocationalism, the worship of technology and an insistence on quantifiable criteria for success in the basics of reading comprehension and arithmetic have and are diverting attention away from multicultural educational efforts.

The ranked importance of multicultural fieldwork at the pre-sevice and in-service levels is presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

RANKED IMPORTANCE OF MULTICULTURAL FIELDWORK

IMPORTANCE	PRE-SERVICE	IN-SERVICE
Essential	1 (N=26)	3 (N=15)
Important	2 (N=23)	1 (N=18)
Useful	3 (N=23)	2 (N=17)
Marginal	4 (N=22)	4 (N=15)
Irrelevant	5 (N=22)	5 (N=15)

While 26 respondents ranked multicultural fieldwork within the U.S. as "essential" for pre-service education students, only 19 representatives stated that their school provides multicultural fieldwork for their students.

Twenty-one respondents (72%) stated that they were satisfied that their school covers multicultural education adequately.

Shifting the focus of multiculturalism to global scope, respondents were asked to rank their perceptions of the general importance of an intenational, comparative dimension for teachers as-well-as the specific importance of both pre-service and in-service course work in comparative education. The results of respondents' rankings are presented in Table V.

TABLE V

IMPORTANCE OF COMPARATIVE EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS

GENERAL IMPORTANCE		PRE-SERVICE IMPORTANCE		IN-SERVICE IMPORTANCE	
Extremely useful	3 (N-22)	Essential	4 (N=22)	3	(N=14)
Very useful	1 (N=23)	Important	2 (N=21)	2	(N=15)
Useful	2 (N=26)	Useful	1 (N=26)	1	(N=19)
Of little use	4 (N=23)	Marginal	3 (N=23)	4	(N=14)
Of no Use	5 (N=22)	Irrelevant	5 (N=21)	5	(N=14)

Comparative education was generally ranked very useful, useful and extremely useful. However, comparative education is offered as a separate, elective course on only 5 (17%) of the campuses in Wisconsin. It is not a requirement in any Bachelors or Masters level program. Two campuses are considering adding a comparative education course to their list of offerings "sometime" in the future. Eighteen campuses (62%) sponsor overseas study opportunities for their education students. Table VI presents the priority importance of overseas visits or study tours at the pre-service and in-service levels.

TABLE VI

RANKED IMPORTANCE OF OVERSEAS VISITS OR STUDY TOURS

IMPORTANCE	PRE-SERVICE	IN-SERVICE
Essential	4 (N=23)	4 (N=14)
Important	2 (N=23)	2 (N=20)
Useful	1 (N=23)	1 (N=16)
Marginal	3 (N=23)	3 (N=15)
Irrelevant	5 (N=20)	5 (N=14)

Respondents ranked the major benefits of comparative studies in education to be: 1) to provide deeper insight into their own educational systems,

2) to breakdown ethnocentrism, 3) to identify common problems/issues, 4) to foster "worldmindedness" and 5) to broaden the mind.

Respondents were asked to rank the importance of knowledge of our interdependence with other nations for pre-service education majors. Table VII presents respondents' rankings.

TABLE VII

RANKED IMPORTANCE OF KNOWLEDGE OF OUR INTERDEPENDENCE

IMPORTANCE	PRE-SERVICE
Essential	3 (N=23)
Important	1 (N=23)
Useful	2 (N=24)
Marginal	4 (N=22)
Irrelevant	5 (N=21)

Respondents were asked if they were satisfied with their program's coverage of our interdependence with other nations. Some 24 (83%) said, "No", while only six (17%) said, "Yes."

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

1. Teacher Education program representatives in Wisconsin unanimiously rank multicultural experiences and multicultural knowledge to be of highest priority for students in pre-service education in 1985/86.

2. Program promises and commitments to provide multicultural experiences and multicultural knowledge were rarely designed to permiate the entire (4-year) pre-service programs of students in the early 1970s. More recently, in the 1980s, such programs which were undertaken in the 1970s, have been phased down due to budget cuts and resource reallocations.

3. While 26 respondents ranked multicultural fieldwork as "essential" for pre-service education majors, only 19 of the 26 respondents' programs (73%) offer fieldwork. Only 21 of a total of 29 respondents (72%) stated that they were satisfied that their schools cover multicultural education--the highest ranking priority--adequately.

4. Multiculturalism treated internationally is much less well attended than multiculturalism treated intranationally:

   -only 5 of Wisconsin's 30 teacher education programs (17%) offer Comparative Education and these offerings are electives, not requirements;

   -only 6 of Wisconsin's 29 teacher education program representatives (21%) stated that they were satisfied with their program's coverage of interdependence with other nations.

James A. Banks has written that intranational, multiethnic education, may gain a new partner during the 1980s--global education. He argues that the position of the U.S. as a world leader demands that we deal more imaginatively and constructively with the enormous cultural differences outside our borders.[14]

I come back to my comments in the abstract of this paper. Little is being done in teacher education programs in Wisconsin to address ethnocentric attitudes or to prepare students for teaching in multicultural classrooms. Unless we can introduce more content in multicultural education into students' pre-service programs, there is little hope for change.

FOOTNOTES

1. Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1976

2. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education - Fiscal Year 1974. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978. p.8.

3. Howsam, Robert B., Dean C. Corrigan, et. al. Educating a Professor. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education 1976, p. 108-109.

4. Brembeck, Cole S. and Walker H. Hill, Cultural Challenges to Education, Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath and Company, 1973, p.3.

5. Le Compte, Margaret D., "Defining the Differences: Cultural Subgroups Within the Educational Mainstream," The Urban Review, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1985.

6. Mason, W.J. and Bain, R.K., Teacher Turnover in Public Schools, 1957-58 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Circular No. 608, 1959.

7. Bloom, Benjamin S. Human Characteristics and School Learning, New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1976 p. 142.

8. Ibid., p. 142

9. Howsam, Robert B., op.cit., pp 108-9.

10. Hilliard, Asa G., "Restructuring Teacher Education for Multicultural Imperatives," Multicultural Education Through Competency Based Teacher Education, William H. Hunter, Editor. Washington, D.C.: American Asssociation of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974. pp 44-47.

11. Moore, W.L., The Development of the Wisconsin Human Relations Policy and its Implementation on one University Campus, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: UW-Madison, 1976, p. 276.

12. Kohl, William C., unpublished letter dated June 2, 1972 to UW-Milwaukee Chancelor J. Martin Klotsche.

13. Moore, W.L., op.cit., pp 308-9.

14. Banks, James A. "Multiethnic Education at the Crossroads", in Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 64, No. 8, April 1983, p. 559.